WORKERS OF THE WORLD. UNITE

THE MILITANT

Weekly Organ of the Communist League of America [Opposition]

Entered as second class mail matter, November 28, 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879.

VOLUME IV, NO. 17 [WHOLE NO. 76] NEW YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 1, 1931 PRICE 5 CENTS

LEON TROTSKY

Nine-Tenths of Our Activities for the Revolution in Spain

On the Maurin Group in Catalonia and the Left Opposition

◆◆◆

It would be most harmful, most dangerous and even most disastrous were the idea to sink into the minds of the workers of Catalonia, of Spain and of the whole world that we are solidary with the policy of the Catalonian Federation or that we bear responsibility for it, or, at least, that we are closer to it than to the Centrist grouping. The Stalinists present matters in this way with all their might. Up to now we have not fought against this with sufficient vigor. It is all the more important and urgent to dispel this misunderstanding which compromises us terribly and which hampers the development of the Catalonian and the Spanish workers.

To be sure, the denunciation of the Catalonian Federation is a task which falls in the first place to our supporters in Catalonia itself. They must come forward with a clear, open, precise criticism, a criticism which does not pass over in silence anything in the policy of Maurin, of that concoction of petty bourgeois prejudices, of ignorance, of provincial "science" and of political knavery.

The Federation in the Elections

In the elections to the Cortes, the Federation received nearly 10,000 votes. That is not much. But in a revolutionary epoch, a really revolutionary organization is capable of growing quickly. There is however a circumstance which diminishes the weight of these 10,000 votes: in the elections to the Cortes, the Catalonian Federation received less votes than in the municipal elections in Barcelonia, that is, in the most important revolutionary center. This fact, trifling at first sight has an enormous symptomatic significance. It shows that while in the most secluded corners of the country a flow of workers, however feeble, is manifested towards the Federation, in Barcelona, the confusion of Maurin does not attract but repulses the workers. Of course, the inevitable bankruptcy of Macia may aid even Maurin, as a bankrupt of second order. But the impotence of the present leadership of the Federation is demonstrated completely by the elections to the Cortes: really, special "talents" are required to tax one's ingenuity so as not to increase one's influence in Barcelona during the three months of the revolution!

What does the Federation represent in the language of revolutionary politics? Is it a Communist organization? and precisely what kind—of the Right wing, the Center or the Left? It is beyond doubt that they are revolutionary workers, potential Communists who vote for the Federation. But they have as yet no clarity in their minds. And where is it to come from if these workers are led by confusionists? Under these conditions, the most determined, the boldest, the most consistent workers must inevitably rush to the side of the official party. The latter obtained only 170 votes in Barcelona and nearly 1,000 in all of Catalonia. But it must not be thought that these are the worst elements. On the contrary, most of these elements might be with us and they will be when we unfurl our banner.

At the beginning of the 1917 revolution, the majority of the Russian social democratic organizations had a mixed character, including in their ranks Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, conciliators etc. The tendency for unification was so great at the conference of the Bolshevik party at the end of March, that Stalin, a few days before the arrival of Lenin, pronounced himself in favor of the unification with the Mensheviks. Certain provincial organizations remained mixed up to the October revolution. I picture the Catalonian Federation as a sort of similar mixed organization, a not defined organization which includes future Bolsheviks and future Mensheviks. This justifies the policy which seeks to introduce into the ranks of the Federation a political differentiation. The first step in this road is the denunciation of the vulgar policy of Maurinism. Here one must be merciless. The comparison of the Catalonian Federation with the unified organizations of Russia, nevertheless requires essential restrictions. The unified organizations did not exclude any existing social democratic grouping. All of them had the right to fight for their opinions inside the unified organization. The matter is quite different in the Catalonian Federation. There, "Trotskyism" is put on the index. Every confusionist has the right to defend his confusionism there, but the Bolshevik-Leninist cannot raise his voice openly. Thus, this eclectic mixed unified organization delimits itself from the Left wing at the very outset. But by that very fact it becomes a chactic bloc of Centrist and Right wing tendencies. Centrism can develop either to the Left or else to the Right. The Centrism of the Catalonian Federation which rejects the Left wing during the revolution is doomed to a shameful destruction. The task of the Left Opposition consists of precipitating this destruction by its merciless criticism.

Unity a la Maurin

But there is another circumstance to which an exceptional importance must be attributed. The Catalonian Federation is officially for the unification of all the Communist organizations and groupings. It is certain that the rank and file sincerely and loyally desire this unity, even though they attach all sorts of illusions to the slogan. We are entirely alien to these illusions. We are fighting for unity because within the framework of a unified party we hope to conduct with success a progressive work of **ideological delimitation** on the basis of questions and tasks imposed not from without, but flowing from the development of the Spanish revolution itself. But we support in every way the struggle for the unification of the Communists. The fundamental condition for this unification is for us the right to the possibility of fighting for our slogans, for our points of view within the framework of the unified organization. We can and we must promise a complete loyalty in this struggle, but the fundamental condition is destroyed at the very outset by the Federation itself: while fighting under the banner of unity, it banishes the Bolshevik-Leninists from its own ranks. Under these conditions, to support the leading role of the Catalonian Federation in the struggle for the unity of the Communist party would be the greatest absurdity on our part. At the unification congress, Maurin is preparing himself to play first fiddle. Can we tolerate in silence this revolting hypocrisy? In fighting against the Left Opposition, Maurin apes the Stalinist bureaucracy so as to win its favors. In reality he says to the Stalinists: Give me your blessing and above all your subsidies, and I promise you to fight against the Bolshevik-Leninists not out of fear but in all sincerity. The unifying activity of Maurin is only a form of blackmail against the Stalinists. Were we to keep quiet about it, we would not be revolutionists, but passive auxiliaries to political blackmail. We must denounce mercilessly the role of Maurin, that is, his "unifying" charlatanism, without for a single instant weakening our struggle for the genuine unification of the Communist ranks and without weakening our struggle for the Communist ranks to range themselves under our banner.

Nine-tenths of the work of the International Left must be concentrated today upon Spain. All expenditures must be restricted so as to have the possibility of establishing a weekly in Spanish and periodic publications in Catalan, at the same time issuing leaflets in great number. The question must considered of restricting all expenditures for other purposes without exception, in order to lend the greatest aid to the Spanish Opposition.

The International Secretariat in my opinion, must devote nine-tenths of its forces to the questions of the Spanish revolution. We must simply forget that there exists in the world any kind of Landau. We must turn our backs upon all the quarrels, upon all the intrigues and the intrigants, without devoting a single minute to them. The most important documents must be printed without delay and submitted to a necessary criticism. The next number of the **International Bulletin** must be devoted entirely to the Spanish revolution. We must also take a number of organizational measures. For this we need men and means. Both must be found.

There is not and there cannot be a greater crime than the loss of time.

Kadikoy, July 8, 1931.

—LEON TROTSKY.

Silk Revolt Growing

Policies of All Elements under Test of the Struggle in Paterson

Events are developing rapidly in Paterson, center of the silk industry and scene of historical labor revolts. In the glare of the developing class struggle the various contending groups in the labor movement are being shown up in their true character and all policies are being put to the test of life.

Last week we reported the strike called by the National Textile Workers Union and urged upon the Communists who direct this organization the adoption of a united front policy in order to consolidate the workers and disarm the reformists. On Tuesday the Associated and the United Textile Workers called their strike having advanced the date from August first under pressure of the strike action of the N. T. W.

The relation of forces at present appears to favor the reformists. They have an established organization, have made rather extensive preparations and are assured of a fairly strong support among certain sections of the silk workers. The unity effected between the Associated and the United Textile Workers has had a consolidating effect in their favor.

All the developments are taking place under the compulsion of a powerful movement from below. The silk workers, oppressed to the limit of endurance, are determined to strike. No one could hold them back. The question of strike has already been settled in the minds of the workers. The only problem that could arise under the circumstances is: Who will lead the strike, and how will it be conducted?

In this dynamic siytuation how do the various contending elements and groups reveal themselves?

1. The Communists. The National Textile Workers Union, which is under the leadership of the Communist Party, showed the poorest preparation for the events, and were prevented from the necessary preliminary growth by incorrect tactics and leadership. They had tried to compensate for these defects and weaknesses by an arbitrary precipitation of the strike before the date set by the reformists. By a militant and agressive campaign they quickly demonstrated that the National Textile Workers Union represents a real force in the situation, if not at present the strongest force. But their hopes to take the field away from the reformists by this coup met with failure, as could easily have been foreseen. The organization of the Associated and United Textile Workers remained intact and the grip of the reformists upon the members was strengthened by the irresponsible putschist tactics of the Communists.

2. The Musteites. The leadership of the combined Associated and United Textile Workers rests for the most part in the hands of adherents of the C. P. L. A. The timidity, vacillation and fear of struggle which are bred in the very narrow in these come-ons for McMahon have shown themselves in the Passaic situation in full bloom. Their hesitation and delay with the strike are only an advance notice of the speed with which they will endeavor to end it and the terms they will be prepared to accept for its termination. They are jumping now because they are afraid of the Communist union. The fear of the Communists is the principal motivating factor in every step they take which gives the appearance of militancy and aggressiveness.

3. The Lovestoneites. The Paterson struggle shows these people up in their true colors more vividly than a thousand arguments. This thoroughly opportunist faction—only yesterday the official leadership of the Communist Party, supported by the Comintern—has flatly turned its back on Communism at Paterson. Gitlow appears there as the cover for the Musteites in their fight against the National Textile Workers Union, as the Musteites are the cover for McMahon. The Lovestoneites took part in the negotiations to unite the two reformist organizations and are exerting all their efforts now to make it an effective unity against the National Textile Workers Union. In the real test of the class struggle at Paterson, where deeds take the place of words, the Lovestoneites have already found their place in the camp of anti-Communism.

The National Textile Workers Union is undoubtedly a force in the situation. Its strength is the strength of the militant spirit of the workers, of their profound and justified hatred of the U. T. W. officials who have sold them to the bosses more than once and their distrust of the field men of these notorious reactionaries and betrayers—the Musteites. The weaknesses of the N. T. W. is the incompetence and the false policy of its leadership—that is to say, the leadership of the Communist Party. They shout against the reformists, but they do not know how to fight them. They speak of a united front of the workers but by their tactics they defeat it. This is the heart of their mistake in Paterson. And by it they are entrenching the position of the C. P. L. A. elements and through them the treacherous bureaucracy of the U. T. W., and through them the bosses.

In last week's **Militant** we warned the Communists at Paterson that they could not ignore the reformist organization which has a larger membership and a better organizational base. Here we wish to repeat again the most solemn warning to the National Textile Workers Union: You must go to the workers with a genuine united front policy. Make a direct proposal to the Associated and United Textile Workers to form a joint strike committee, to unite all the striking workers under a single directing body. Show the workers that you are willing to give them an opportunity to test the contending policies, leaders and organizations for themselves in a united strike movement. Let the reformists refuse such a proposal at their own risk. The workers want unity, make no mistake about that. Trust the workers to understand what a real unity proposal is when they see it.

On this road the N. T. W. will become the leading force for the consolidation and victory of the workers and its strength will increase with the intensification of the struggle and the bankruptcy of reformist policies which will be revealed in this test of action. The present suicidal course of the N. T. W. is leading to a certain defeat for the workers and the Communists, and consequently to a victory for the bosses and their lieutenants.

Issues of great import for the whole future of the Left wing movement are at stake in Paterson, as is the case also in the mine strikes. The trade union question, which is a life and death question for the American Communist movement, is being transferred from the field of abstract polemics into the field of action and all views are being tested there. Nothing that happens will be concealed. No mistakes will go unpunished. The Communist workers throughout the entire country are duty bound to watch these developing strike struggles with the greatest attentiveness. Paterson is a rehearsal of greater battles yet to come. The movement will judge everyone by his performance there.

—J. P. C.

SPAIN

The Revolution Day by Day

IN THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF SPAIN

Some comrades, internationally, criticize the Spanish Communist Opposition, accusing it of lacking initiative. There is some truth in this criticism but only in part. It must be taken into account that the Spanish Communist Opposition could hold its national conference only recently, and that the best militants were unable to act as they should, being in prison or in flight up to a few months ago. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that certain of the principal militants have lacked in will, which has had the natural consequence of a lack of initiative.

But in general, the S. C. O. has been and is the first to put forth its own correct initiative which are accepted by the ranks of the Spanish C. P. In the question of the Trade Union Reconstruction conference of Seville, the S. C. O. was the first to denounce the danger of the split prepared by the E. C. of the Spanish C. P., and its energetic intervention caused the **Batalla** and the Catalonian-Balearic Communist Federation, which had pronounced themselves for the conference to change their minds and to accept our thesis, without however admitting it.

At the present moment, a broad current of opinion in all the groups of

(Continued on page 3)

WAGE-CUTS

White House OK's the Drive

The wage-slashing drive throughout the country has now been given an official fountain-head in the form of a letter from Secretary of Commerce Lamont to the Democratic congressman Condon of Rhode Island, which puts the Hoover administration formally on record not only for "hands off" the wage-cuts, but even for encouraging them. As the period of the "depression" lengthens, wrote Lament, many corporations "are faced with the prospect of closing down altogether and thus creating more unemployment or alternately, seeking temporary (!) wage reductions.

"I very greatly regret that these cases should occur, but I do not believe it is the duty of the government to interfere in such cases—neither do I think such interference could be effective."

Condon had pointed out what is already common knowledge—that thousands of textile workers in the New England region have had their wage standards cut down radically in the recent period. The Lamont reply now reveals the true face of the capitalist administration which has for months sought to cover up its approval of wage cuts, and its strike-breaking activities when workers resisted the slashing of their standards, by a hypocritical policy of "assurances" that the White House stood opposed to the cutting down of wages. Even now following the warm reception given the Lamont statement in working class ranks, Secretary of Labor Doak, deportation expert, has spoken for the White House, that is, for Hoover, with the renewed "assurance", worthy of its predecessors that the administration was opposed to wage cuts. But the belated "correction" of the blunter Lamont does not eliminate the stark, brutal fact: Lamont, the former partner in the House of Morgan, millionaire banker and friend of bankers, has given away the whole shabby farce staged by Hoover following the precipitation of the crisis. It is Lamont's voice that really counts, Hoover furnishes an ever thinner smoke-screen.

The Hoover administration has not taken a single step towards intervening against the scores and hundreds of wage cuts jammed down the threats of the workers. Its activity has been confined to sending strike-breaking specialists, disguised as "conciliators" of the Department of Labor, into every possible strike situation. Through the same Department, it has deported thousands of foreign born workers fearing them as the shock troops of the workers' resistance to the capitalist offensive, and is preparing to deport especially those foreign born workers who are associated with the militant and revolutionary sections of the labor movement.

The Lamont pronouncement, despite all "counter" statements by Doak, cannot fail to have a salutary effect upon workers everywhere, dispelling any remaining illusions about the "fairness" of the government. It must awaken in the workers the feeling that only the sharpest and most unified resistance to the offensive of the bosses can save them from been driven to starvation levels. The movement for the united front, to organize the defensive of the workers on the broadest posible scale, assumes exceptional importance in the face of Lamont's having stripped off the mask of the government. The united front movement is aided further by the announcement of the plan to cut the wages of the steel workers—already down to the ground—ten percent. With the miners already in battle a widespread movement of the steel workers would mean the opening of a big new page of history for American labor. For the Communists to overlook this opportunity to mobilize hundreds of thousands of workers under the slogans of the united front would mean a tragic failure to measure up to the great heights of the possibilities now being offered the revolutionary militants to set labor in motion against the capitalist class and its loyal servitors, the government.

Total Unemployed, as officially reported on first of month		
	1930	1931
Jan.	2,895,000	4,439,000
Feb.	3,259.000	4 956,000
Mar.	3,408,000	5,045,000
Apr.	3,091 000	4,830.000
May	2,840,000	4,469,000

Balance of Trade, in millions of marks: — unfavorable, X favorable	
1930	1931
—213	X 10
— 21	X113
X158	X238
X 36	X101
X186	X147

—J. B. F.

After the London Conference

The Buck Is Passed to Germany

In spite of reassuring statements by Hoover and Stimson, it is clear that the London Conference broke up with no tangible results beside a confession of impotence. German bonds and American stocks declined for several days after the conference, indicating the real feeling of Wall Street. Apart from passing the buck to Germany and the bankers, the conference officially prolonged the $100,000 000 credit already granted and uncollectible for another three months—as if it were possible to get it back now. Second, it recommended that the bankers work out some way of converting short-term loans which they now have in Germany (estimated between one and one-fourth and one and one-half millions of dollars) into long-term loans. Nothing is simpler—all that needs to be done is for the Germans not to pay their loans and from short-term, with the passing of time, they become long-term.

This is precisely what the American, English and French bankers realize, and that is why it has not been possible for them to find any way of advancing further short-term credits to Germany. They want to keep "liquid" at all costs in view of the development of the crisis in their own countries, that is keep their funds in such position that they can get at them immediately when necessary to meet a run on deposits, to finance government deficits, or other emergency purposes. In order to keep liquid, they are lending money on call at one or one and one-half percent, or buying short-term notes of strong corporations and municipalities at two to three percent, rather than buy the type of securities into which they usually put their surplus funds, to yield four to five percent. The need for liquidity precludes short-term loans and the sharp drop in German bonds has scared investors so that it is out of the question to issue long-term German bonds through regular investment channels.

One result on German economy which may readily be foreseen is a severe pressure to obtain funds by exporting goods, irrespective of price; at the same time, imports will be severely restricted by the difficulty of obtaining foreign exchange with which to pay for them. The standard of living of the German worker will therefore be cut into from both ends—great quantities of goods which he needs will be shipped abroad without regard to profit, and necessary imports will be curtailed. The balance of trade, however, will be increasingly "favorable". The greater the starvation in Germany, the more "favorable" the balance of trade, as the results for the first five months already show:

Send Generous Aid to the Spanish Left Opposition!

"Nine-tenths of the work of the International Left must be concentrated today upon Spain," writes comrade Trosky in the present issue of the **Militant.** This declaration, which corresponds entirely to the growing importance of the development of the Spanish revolution, will be greeted by every Oppositionist and class conscious militant. Every delay every tendency towards passivity every, idea that comes from an under-evaluation of the Spanish revolutionary situation, will bring tenfold harm to the movement. That is why the Left Opposition must enter vigorously into the foreground of the struggle for the victory of the Spanish revoluion.

The young Spanish Opposition, which has already done such splendid work in the face of great handicaps, must receive the most generous and immediate assistance from the international proletariat. Confined to its monthly review, **Comunismo,** it is put at a great disadvantage in the struggle against the Stalinists and the nationalist "Communists" on the one hand, and against the social democrats and the anarcho-syndicalists on the other. A strong weekly paper is of paramount importance immediately. It will be made possible right away if the Opposition everywhere does the elementary duty—with speed. Money is needed to be forwarded right away. Every Oppositionist must do his part. **All** workers are urged to contribute immediately—the largest possible sums. Money orders and checks should be made payable to comrade A. Gonzales, c-o The **Militant,** 84 East 10th Street, New York, N. Y., who is in charge of the fund in this country. The contributions will be recorded in the **Militant.** The first contributions are as follows:

M. B. G., 25c—Simpson, 1.00—Henry F. 2.00—A. Nacio, 1.00—J. S., 1.00—E. Martinez, 10c—F. Roman, 25c—Anon., 25c—Anon., 25c—Mark, 50c—M. Kallman, 25c—Eddie Wasserman, 25c—H. Martel 15c—B. J. Field, 1.00—L. Stone, 25c—Wm. von Borstel, 50c—A. Gomez, 50c—Un Communista—50c.—TOTAL TO DATE: $10.00.

The money has already been forwarded to Spain.

The British Scene

The Unemployment Problem

Two years ago when the British Labor Party won the parliamentary elections, aided by its glittering promises of gradual development into "socialism" and of a definite cure for the unemployment situation, it naturally stood out in bold contrast to the reactionary Baldwin Tory government. However, when in power, the labor agents of imperialism, even to attain their promised reforms, would be compelled to go beyond the bounds of reformism and engage in a struggle with the actual rulers of the system from which they would again have to draw certain revolutionary conclusions. Such are the relations between yesterday and today. And in politics, it is one thing to promise and another thing to attain. Of course, the MacDonald coterie of leadership never had any serious intentions with their promised reforms.

But the working masses who expected something from their support of MacDonald have received nothing but disillusionment. What among the grotesque figures in knee-breeches at the British court, may be considered quite brilliant victories won in the diplomatic field, are not worth a brass farthing to the masses. On the contrary, it has only helped further to reduce their position and hence their dissatisfaction with the "labor" government is now growing apace. Thus the future does hold promises for the British workers, and far more real than MacDonald's election promises. The future holds promises of defeat of the disgraceful illusions of laborism.

In the two major problems facing the British working class directly at home to which splendid promises had been given, those of the unemployment situation and the repeal of the anti-trade union act, the "labor" government failed signally—or what would be more correct to say—it acted precisely as a government, capitalist also in name, would have acted.

The Serious Unemployment Situation

At the time of the liberal labor politicians taking over the golden reins of his majesty's government, in June 1929 there were a total of 1,100,125 unemployed officially registered. On July 6, 1931, their numbers had more than doubled and were 2,634,288. The dole system initiated in 1920 and intended then as a temporary measure, has since become permanent in character. And while the weight of the dole is becoming rather irksome to British capitalist society the "labor" cabinet is considering means of lightening this "burden" by shifting the load to the backs of the workers.

It attempted to substitute migration of the unemployed to the Dominions. But this had to be discarded even by the hidebound reactionary Jimmie Thomas lord privy seal and first minister of unemployment. The Dominions, having such problems of their own, did not want the unemployed. He found a perplexing problem and succeeded in getting relief only for himself in form of a change to the Dominions. His successor to tackle the unemployment problem, Vernon Hartshorn, died in office. So while the unemployment problem remained and became more acute, all parties,—exclusive, of course, of the Communist party—, were called upon for help. The Royal Commission was created and it returned a report for a cut in the dole and an increase of payments to the fund. According to the report unemployment relief would be reduced, for example for a family with three children, from $8.00 weekly to $7.25. Workers with jobs would be required to pay to the unemployment fund 4 cents more weekly, employers 2 cents and the state 3 cents more. However, this was too raw even for the "labor" government to support. It would have become dynamite to the growing dissension within its own party ranks, so it confined itself to sponsoring a bill for the elimination of "abuses" of the dole evidently hoping that in the process, in committee, more teeth could be put into the bill. For the sake of facilitation Snowden had already announced, prior to presenting his budget, that, only drastic and disagreeable means" would prevent the country from slipping into bankruptcy.

The Communist Party and Unemployment

It seems quite paradoxical that the British Communist Party has proven itself almost entirely unable to take advantage of this long protracted serious unemployment problem. It has, of course, religiously observed all the Stalinist calendar dates of unemployment demonstrations, but they have become mainly formal exercises. Their significance as well as the number of participants have dwindled. The party in the unemployment situation has not been able to set the workers into motion around a revolutionary perspective, nor to instill the life and spirit necessary to advance.

The crux of the party's demands has been to shift the burden of unemployment from the workes to the bourgeoisie. Thus its outlook became limited to one of a purely national reformist character. It could make little or no distinction from the views of the "Left" within the labor party and the trade union officials who contends that if the state—that is the capitalist state—cannot assure work for its citizens it must provide them with a free living. For the workers, there could hardly be anything else to do than attempt as best as they could to adjust themselves to the "inevitable" dole. Until the British Communist Party is able to extricate itself from such views it will remain pretty well paralyzed.

The Anti-Trade Union Act

The vicious Trades Dispute and Trade Union Act, legislated by the preceding Baldwin government after it had become so frightened during the general strike, increased the miners' workday from seven to eight hours; it prohibited any coercive strike over wages or similar disputes which may tend to have a direction against the established order; it prohibited civil service employees from joining unions; finally it also prohibited any levy upon trade unions for political purposes. To the liberal labor party lackeys this latter clause became the only real obnoxious part and accounts for their zeal in election promises to repeal the act. But then, after assuming power a way was easily found to overcome that, so when the socalled bill of repeal was promulgated it could easily be allowed to be ditched and die in committee. Meanwhile when the Scottish and Welsh miners fought against the spread-over (the eight hour day) and to uphold the more recent Coal Miners Act which provided first for a seven and a half-hour day and by July a seven-hour day, MacDonald advised the miners to accept the spread-over in return for a promised minimum wage law for miners.

To expect from this champion of gradualness to sponsor a movement for the shorter workday to relieve unemployment would, of course, be ridiculous. His "gradualness" leads in the opposite direction knowing, as he does that the shorter workday would cut directly in to the absolute surplus value still pocketed by the lords of finance and industry. Yet it is absolutely certain that the productive capacity of British industry and the output per man has grown to an extent making a demand for a six-hour day without reduction of pay as potent as was the demand for the eight-hour day when first advanced. There are at least good reasons to assume that it could become, in the present unemployment situation, a powerful rallying cry for the working class and a means of unifying the employed with the unemployed. It could become a means to help bridge the gulf of the present retreat and defensive toward the working class offensive. From the point of view of building a class movement if utilized by the Communist Party, this slogan could undoubtedly become an effective supplement to the feeble demands of the charter movement. Oh yes, the party has already adopted the seven-hour day slogan; but apparently it overlooks (?) the fact that the seven-hour day is today supposed to be law for the coal miners and as a slogan for a movement it could hardly mean much to them.

What Does the Balance Sheet Show?

The salient fact is that the considerable and militant unemployment movement once existing has practically disappeared. The British Communist Party failed to consolidate this movement and to help assure its revolutionary course. It failed in the necessary class education and thus could not raise the general class level of this movement. It is now failing to take advantage of the costly experiences of the British workers who put their fate into an excursion in the degenerate field of laborism. Yet the unemployment problem is still the center of gravity in England pressing ever more acutely for a solution. A beginning can be made only when the masses are actually set into motion upon a definitely revolutionary course.

With its two years in power the Fabian gradualness of reformism has quite clearly revealed its miserable role. From once having played a historically progressive role, it is reaching its inevitable conclusion. At its very apex its true character is being exposed. The labor party leadership as a reactionary obstacle is losing its hold upon the masses. There is today a mighty abyss created by the contradiction between the vital needs of the masses and the reactionary imperialist course of the "labor" government. In this lies the great future prospects for the British Communist Party. Despite all its wasting of the capital of the world revolutionary movement it still has the opportunity to utilize these possibilities. —ARNE SWABECK.

The Catalonian Federation's Platform

I have just read for the first time in **La Lutte de Classes** of the platform of the socalled "Workers' and Peasants' Bloc" under the name of which the Catalonian Federation acts. I acknowledge that the document is translated in **La Lutte de Classes** in a thorough and a correct manner. The document as a whole, from beginning to end, produces a painful impression. All that I have written in my latest work: "The Spanish Revolution in Danger", against the official policy of the C. I. in the Spanish question, applies entirely to the Catalonian Federation. Even more, the latter commits errors which the leadership of the C. I. has already given up, at least in words.

1. The document is issued by the "Workers' and Peasants' Bloc". What is this? A pseudonym for the Catalonian Federation? The bloc, that is, the union of the workers and the peasants, is a gigantic political **task** which the proletarian vanguard must accomplish. This task must be written into its platform. In place of this, the "Workers' and Peasants' Bloc" becomes the name of the revolutionary organization. This is nothing else but a new edition of the workers' and peasants' party. Yet even the Sixth Congress of the Comintern renounced this reactionary idea under the criticism of the Left Opposition.

2. In all the documents the word Communism is not pronounced a single time. Whoever hides his Communism from the masses, ceases to be a Communist.

Menshevik Criticism

3. They speak of the democratic revolution, of the democratic republic, of the popular revolution, without the slightest attempt at a class analysis. The government is accused of indecision, of vacillation, etc. . . . But nowhere is it said that it is a government of the bourgeoisie, an enemy of the people. The criticism of the Zamora government coincides entirely with the criticism addressed by the Mensheviks and the Social Revolutionists to the government of Prince Lvov-Kerensky. On the subject of the Macia government nothing is said.

4. The document speaks of a "rational construction of society", without explaining what this means. It is the language of the "true" socialists of before 1848. Then it says: "The republic must signify a new social organization" Which? Is it a question of a bourgeois regime or of a socialist regime? The platform plays hide and seek with capitalism and with socialism.

5. The fact of having given Alfonso the possibility of fleeing abroad is presented as a "first profound **mistake** of the provisional government." Mistake? Is this to mean that Zamora is not sufficiently "sensible" in his revolutionary policy? This is how the Russian Mensheviks put the question. To call a "mistake" that which with the bourgeoisie is a deliberate counter-revolutionary calculation, means to whitewash the bourgeoisie and to cover it up before the masses.

6. "The republic must not only be a conquest for the bourgeoisie but also for the workers." What is the meaning of this mealy-mouthed, vulgarly democratic and profoundly false phrase? Where and when has a republic existed which satisfied at the same time the interests of the bourgeoisie and those of the workers? From the republic bourgeoisie, we can and should demand democratic rights and social reforms, ceaselessly exposing the bourgeois, even the arch-democratic republic as a machine which the bourgeoisie uses to squeeze the sweat and blood of the workers and the peasants.

7. The reference to the republic of 1873 is accompanied by this incredible moral: "Thus, a complete division was created between the power and the people." The abstraction of the people is separated from the abstraction of the power. Perhaps the bourgeoisie separated itself from the **working** people? The example of 1873 must be referred to not in order to insist that the bourgeoisie becomes softer, better, more generous more tender, but in order to teach the masses not to believe for a single instant in the more "generous", the "softer", the "tenderer" bourgeoisie. That is how the Marxists put the question.

8. The platform calls upon the "working masses to organize themselves in all the provinces upon the basis of revolutionary Juntas". To what end? No program is indicated. Not only is it not indicated that Juntas of this kind will have to guarantee the revolutionary passage of power into the hands of the workers and the poor peasants, but a program of transitional demands is not put forward: 7-hour working day, control of production, organization through revolutionary Juntas of workers and of soldiers for the agrarian uprising. They do not mention by a single word that the Junta is an organization of the proletariat and the exploited masses **against** the class which is in power, that is, **against the bourgeoisie.** The Junta is taken as a "revolutionary organization" in the spirit of the Spanish petty bourgeois tradition.

9. In speaking of the importance of the agrarian uprising the platform refers to the French and the Russian revolutions. Not a word about the experience of the Chinese revolution which, under our very eyes, has just been strangled by the leadership of the C. I. Did the Comintern "solve" the agrarian question in China correctly? Not a word about that. The Communist who has not profited by the lessons of the Chinese revolution has no right to address himself to the masses in order to teach them and to issue appeals to them, especially in a revolutionary country.

10. The platform says: "We are supporters of a State for each nation." What does this mean for Spain? What nation is involved? The Pan-Spanish state organization is defined as follows: "The Union of the Republics of Iberia." What does this mean? If it means a federation, it would be better to say so.

11. "The defense of the revolution must be the supreme law." Defense against whom? The bourgeoisie in power defends "its" revolution against the proletariat. Whoever conceals this fact behind hollow phrases on the defense **in general** of the revolution **in general** against enemies **in general, helps the** bourgeoisie to stifle the proletariat under the banner of the revolution.

12. The "Workers' and Peasants' Bloc", that is, the workers' and peasants' party, promises at the end of its platform to "fight with all its strength for the complete realization of the democratic revolution" Does this mean the bourgeois republic on the basis of democratic parliamentarism? Then one must say so, but in this case it is necessary at least to put forward demands for **democratic electoral rights,** inasmuch as before the "rational" republic and the "rational organization of "society" is realized on the Iberian Peninsula, it is necessary that the **bourgeois** republic of Zamora at least gives to the workingman and the workingwoman, the peasant and the peasant woman, the right to vote.

13. The name of the Socialist party is not mentioned in the platform. Not a word is said about the anarcho-syndicalists. The official Communist party is not mentioned. One might say that the "Workers' and Peasants' Bloc" is prepared to act in the void.

Spanish Kuo Min Tangism

These are the rapid objections that I believe it necessary to make on the basis of the text published in **La Lutte de Classes.** It is possible that, already, the Catalonian Federation has introduced into its platform some change, correction or amendment, or other. I am ready, to be sure, to welcome every step of the Federation in the sense of Marxism. But the document as it stands represents a pure "Kuo Min Tangism" transported to Spanish soil. The ideas and the methods against which the Opposition fought implacably when it was a question of the Chinese policy of the Comintern, find their most disastrous expression in this document. As far as I know, the leaders of the Catalonian Federation systematically draw a line of demarcation from the Left Opposition. This is not enough: the Left Opposition must draw a line of demarcation in a clear and precise manner from the ideas and the methods which are expressed by the leaders of the Catalonian Federation in the document which we have just analyzed briefly. A false point of departure during a revolution is inevitably translated in the course of events into the language of defeat. The Spanish Left Opposition, weak though it is, can render enormous services to the proletariat and to the Spanish revolution. But in order to fulfill this mission, it must establish in its own ranks a regime of **clarity, of honesty and of intransigeance.** It is to this that I call our Spanish friends.

June 12, 1931

—LEON TROTSKY.

CHICAGO MEETING

JOHN EDWARDS
will speak on
"WHAT IS TROTSKY'S PROGRAM?"
at
1118 West Madison Street
on
Saturday, August 8, 1931

Admission free
Auspices: Chicago Communist League

ALFA: Notes of a Journalist

MANUILSKY, THE LEADER OF THE COMINTERN

Nothing can be done about it: Manuilsky is at present the leader of the Comintern. The strongest side of this man lies in the fact that he does not take himself seriously. This is evidence that he is inclined to self-criticism. Whether it is because Stalin does not take the Comintern seriously, or for some other reason it was nevertheless decided that Manuilsky, who does not take himself seriously, is the most suitable man for the most suitable place. And who else was to be put there?

If a complete collection of the "works" of Manuilsky should be gathered, we would have, if not an instructive, at any rate an entertaining book. Manuilsky was always somebody's armor-bearer, moreover, he changed his "knights" many times; he stayed longest with the not unknown Alexinsky. At present, Manuilsky as Yaroslavsky's armor-bearer is one of the prosecution apprentices in matters of Trotskyist ideology. Under his own name and under pseudonyms, he has again and again proved the irreconcilability of Trotskyism and Leninism. But he has not always spoken this way. In 1918, Manuilsky issued a pamphlet in which he wrote that the "honor of liberating Bolshevism from national-limitedness and its transformation into a theory of international proletarian revolution, belongs to L. D. Trotsky"*. At one of the Plenums of the Comintern, Trotsky quoted this citation, "famous" in its way, in the presence of Manuilsky and with full justification ridiculed the citation and its author. The pamphlet was written by Manuilsky after the October revolution and what is more after its publication not a single hair fell from his head. It is true, it may be said but this was prior to the . . . "trade union discussion", and later on Manuilsky changed his views. Not in the least. Recently, we came across a quotation from an article by Manuilsky written in 1922, consequently, at the time when Lenin's illness was already drawing its final balance under the relationships between Lenin and Trotsky. Here is what Manuilsky wrote in the article, devoted to the memory of Chudnovsky: " . . . The **Social Democrat,** published in Switzerland by comrades Lenin and Zinoviev; the Paris **Golos,** which was subsequent to its suppression by the French police, renamed **Nasha Slovo,** directed by comrade Trotsky will be for the future historian of the Third International the fundamental fragments out of which the new revolutionary ideology of the international proletariat has been hammered out." ("Annals of the Revolution", No. 1, page 229, 1922.)

At present Manuilsky proves that during the war Trotsky was a pacifist and a Kautskyan, that Leninism and Trotskyism—are two irreconcilable entities, but in 1922, he maintained neither more nor less than that "the new revolutionary ideology of the international proletariat", that is, the ideology of modern Communism, was created by Lenin and Trotsky. Precisely when did Manuilsky see the light of truth? Neither in 1914-1916 when he worked with Trotsky in the Paris paper, **Nasha Slovo,** nor in 1917-1922, when Manuilsky, together with the whole party, worked under the leadership of Lenin, was the light of truth revealed to him. Only after illness and later on, death took Lenin out of the ranks, and the epigones spurred on by a wave of Thermidorian reaction, declared war upon the ideological heritage of Lenin under the name of "Trotskyism", did Manuilsky begin to recover his sight. By the way, not all at once. The "trinity" (Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev) kept him in the background for a long time, and only after it had by that brought him to semi-repentance, did it give him an ultimatum: open up a campaign against Rakovsky as an introduction to a campaign against Trotsky. Manuilsky, after wavering (Rakovsky's prestige was too high) accepted the condition and thus bought himself a place on the Central Committee of the party. This deal was no secret to the broad party circles, because Manuilsky himself, with his characteristic cynicism, portrayed this deal with reference to persons, revealing his high talents as a raconteur of national and other ancedotes. We repeat, this man never took himself seriously, either politically or morally. And he has now been put at the head of the Communist International. And he is now working out the routes for the Spanish revolution!

AUERBACH CAUGHT WITH THE GOODS

In Moscow, there is published a **Literary Gazette,** the organ of the Federation of Soviet Authors. The critic of this paper is Auerbach. His rights to leadership of literature are determined, on the one hand by the fact that he deserted in time, the ranks of the Opposition, into which he came accidentally (I. N. Smirnov used to say about him: "He won't stay with us—he's too gluttonous".) for the ranks of the bureaucracy, where he is quite at home; on the other hand, by the fact that he has absolutely no literary flair, to which every line of his own writings bear witness. In the **Literary Gazette** for February 19, Auerbach wrote an enormous article entitled "Tempos of Self-Revelation (On Trotsky, Mayakovsky, and Fellow-Travelling)". In the center of the article is a note by Trotsky devoted to Mayakovsky's suicide. From this note, Auerbach extracts a quotation devoted to proletarian literature. The "self-revelation" consists of the fact that Trotsky has finally recognized openly the complete opposition of his views in the question of proletarian culture and proletarian literature to the views of Lenin. However let us produce the quotation from Trotsky's article in the form in which it is quoted by Auerbach with his own parenthetical remarks.

"The struggle for 'proletarian culture' [quotation marks by Trotsky.—L. A.)—something in the form of 'general collectivization' [his own quotation marks. —L. A.] of all the intellectual achievements of humanity in the framework of the Five Year Plan—still had at the beginning of the October revolution a Utopian, idealistic character. It is significant that in this sphere, even then, the contradiction between Lenin and the author of these lines was revealed."

The whole quotation, as we see, is in quotation mark, and what is more, Aeurbach correctly points out the single quotation marks by Trotsky himself. Auerbach is exact and scrupulous. But in spite of this, the Auerbachian style of the quotation, and particularly of its last phrase—"It is significant that in this sphere even then, the conflict between Lenin and the author of these lines was revealed"—is puzzling. Thus, Trotsky not only points out that he had disagreements with Lenin on a definite question, but he even hurries to emphasize the "significance" of the fact that these disagreements were revealed "even then", that is, it would appear that Trotsky makes it his aim to reveal himself. This sounds somewhat puzzling. Auerbach, however, does not spare any comment. "First of all, what is most obvious," he says, "is the frank declaration about the disagreements with Lenin." Really Auerbach is correct. Something is obvious. Further on, it says: "We must be grateful: What is more pleasant to read than the acknowledgment by Trotsky himself of Lenin's disagreement with his views on literature and general questions of culture." The phrase is constructed in an illiterate manner, like the majority of Auerbach's phrases, but it is possible to understand. The whole article ends with the conclusion: "The speed of the self-revelation is significant."

In this manner, in the year 1930, Trotsky revealed himself in the fact that he did not agree with Lenin on his views on literature. On this score, Auerbach celebrates a victory and speaks of the speed of self-revelation. But in the year 1928, Trotsky was exiled to Alma-Ata, and in 1929 was expelled from the country for **counter-revolutionary activity and the preparation of an armed uprising against the Soviet power.** Of what significance, in comparison with this "fact", is Trotsky's disagreement with Lenin on his views on proletarian literature? Where and in what does the speed (!) of self-revelation lie here? Is it not the other way around? Does not this "disproportion" in the accusations reveal — Auerbach's employers? Such is the political side of the matter. But there is also another.

The fact is that Auerbach lied from beginning to end. The quotation which he made is not a quotation; it is a falsification: crude illiterate, insolent—a la Auerbach. Here is word for word the passage from Trotsky's article which Auerbach disfigured:

"The struggle for 'proletarian culture'—something in the form of 'complete collectivization' of all the achievements of humanity in the framework of the Five Year Plan—had at the beginning of the October revolution a character of Utopian idealism—and precisely along this line met with a rebuff from Lenin and the author of these lines."

In this maner, Trotsky says that the philosophy of proletarian culture "met with a rebuff from Lenin and the author of these lines". But Auerbach says: "even then, the conflict between Lenin and the author of these lines was revealed"—neither more nor less! The man who poses as a proletarian critic turns out to be simply a base literary swindler. This time, he has been caught with the goods too crudely and in reality, relieves us of the necessity of making any further comment. However, we cannot help reminding that Auerbach's mendacity assumes a still viler character because he himself is very well informed about Lenin's and Trotsky's relations to the Auerbachian margarine of literary and cultural philosophy. Auerbach knows how rigorously Lenin came out against the theoreticians of the socalled "proletarian culture" in the years when this movement had a revolutionary content, and was not gripped in the hands of the bureaucratic charlatans. Auerbach knows that if Trotsky had "disagreements" with Lenin on this question, they were perhaps expressed in the fact that Trotsky had a softer attitude than Lenin to the infatuations of the ideologists of proletarian culture and at times defended them before Lenin. Auerbach knows that Trotsky wrote his book on literature in agreement with Lenin, who insisted more than once that Trotsky should first of all work out the chapter devoted to proletarian culture and print it in **Pravda.** By the way, its publication was not accompanied by any comments or footnotes by the editor. Yaroslavsky—Yaroslavsky himself!—wrote to Trotsky that he agrees with the viewpoint he expressed. All this is known to Auerbach, because as one of the young aspirants to "proletarian literature," he attempted more than once in those years to find in Trotsky a defender against Lenin's views, but invariably met with rebuff.

Literally, whichever aspect you touch, the ideology of the Centrist bureaucracy is built upon lies, falsifications, on the disfigurement of the past. Just think of it: Here this Auerbach comes out as an instructor and tutor of the proletarian youth! He, Auerbach, paves the way for "proletarian" (!) "culture" (!!). People who can judge by symptoms should understand from this example alone what a fatal danger the present party regime represents for the development of a socialist society and a socialist culture.

Note by the Editor: In corrobation of Alfa's remarks, we print the following parts of a speech of Trotsky together with the quotation by Manuilsky to which Alfa refers, as well as the interjections by Manuilsky during Trotsky's speech:

TROTSKY: I know of only one single literary product—and I became aware of it also only a few weeks ago—in which the attempt is made to make a universal theory out of this theory, to present it as an improvement upon the theoretical attitude of Lenin. I will read this quotation to you. I need not say that I have absolutely nothing in common with this interpretation:

"Russian Bolshevism, born in the nationally-limited revolution of 1905-1906, had to go through the purification ritual of emancipation from all the typical features of national peculiarity, in order to receive all the civil rights of international ideology. Theoretically, this purging of Bolshevism of the national tinge adhering to it was carried through in 1905 by Trotsky, who sought to bring the Russian revolution into harmony with the whole international movement of the proletariat in the idea of the permanent revolution."

This was written not by me, it was written in 1918 by a comrade who bears the name of Manuilsky.

MANUILSKY: So I did say something stupid, and you repeat it!

TROTSKY: Something stupid? Absolutely right! (Laughter). But you need have no concern about comrade Manuilsky; naturally this is a painful subject, for he himself calls it a stupidity. But comrade Manuilsky who has here attributed to me a tremendously heroic deed, without my having earned it, will soon again, without my having earned it, attribute to me two mistakes and in this manner draw his balance. (Laughter).

From the Minutes of the Plenum of the E. C. C. I., November 22—December 13, 1926. German edition, page 583. Berlin,

*Unfortunately, I am obliged to make this quotation from memory, but I fully guarantee the accuracy of thought. A.

DISCUSSION ARTICLES

The Party and the Opposition's Tasks

The problem of stating definitely the road the Opposition must travel in the tasks of restating the basic proletarian trends of the Communist movement must be made the first question of all discussion. The total experience of two and one half years of cohesive political life, with its problems solved and unsolved the sharpening class struggle with its more exacting demands upon the proletarian vanguard, makes further delay inadmissable.

We started our organizational existence with certain definite experiences and traditions. It tok this whole past period to iron out a set of common departures.

Unity and Differecnes

Some of the elements attracted to our banner during this period have found the soil strange (have not been able to orient themselves). Others never really belonged, and it took the organization some time to make this fact evident. On the whole, however our experience with divergent tendencies has been limited. The total political effects of them on the general life of the organization have been beneficial in the main, as they have been the means of enabling the general membership to recognize our principle departures in the face of the test of criticism. It is far from overdrawn to state that "the American section of the Left Opposition is a unified ody on all basic principle questions" (Cannon). Whatever divergence may exist among us can truthfully be stated as differences of tactical application. The differences rising of the various estimations of the tempo of various aspects of the class struggle. The estimation of our organizational relations to the factions of the Communist movement or general working class struggles is basically similiar.

In the evaluation of our relations to the Right wing of the Communist movement, all are agreed that the question of a "united front of the Left and Right against the Center" (Weisbord) can in practise resolve itself into nothing but an unprincipled alliance with a petty bourgeois current against the basic revolutionary objectives of the Communist movement.

Our approach to all political currents within the movement must be conditioned by a scrupulous application of the Marxian dialectic, which postulates that in the examination of any phenomena we must take into consideration the sum total of factors, both objective and subjective. Formal classifications of currents in the movement on their purely objective manifestations will lead us into blind alleys. The alignment of the three currents in the Communist movement are not merely the result of immediate objective application but of a **thorough-going past.** The definite orientations of the Right, Center and Left had a beginning long before the logic of world events pointing to a **temporary** retrenchment of world capitalism became clear. The meeting of three currents within the frame-work of the Comintern, following upon the heels of the October revolution and the post-war revolutionary conditions of the world which temporarily shook the class basis of the petty bourgeoisie and their first cousins, the labor bureaucracy, who despite their past were forced to follow the trend of events, has a definite historical basis. The road of history for a time seemed to point definitely to the coming victory of the proletariat. Elements who by their whole past were prepared for the role of "windbreakers of capitalism" (Cannon) found the conscious evolutionary forces gaining definite headway in influening the proletarian as well as the elements that developing imperialism reduced to the role of declassed elements, whose social and economic base had been weakened, or completely uprooted. (The hegemony over the latter element had always been their sole domain in the past.) The roal left open narrowed down to following these released social forces to their new grounds. With the tremendous all-searching scrutiny, characteristic of the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky in the first four congresses of the Comintern, life was not too pleasant for those gentlemen. With the death of Lenin coupled with the slowing down of the tempo of revolutionary development in the west the gradual ascendancy of revisionist influences upon the dictatorship, with the consequent toning down of revolutionary vigilance in the ranks of the Russian arty, the Right wing found a new lease f life in new surroundings where the ubjective factors that had made intransigeancy to revolutionary principles paramount, gradually being weakened by a combined onslaught of both economically powerful World Imperialism, and its passive agent, vacillating Centrism.

Role of Centrism

Centrism had begun to play the traditional role of "philosophers of futility" (Lenin). "We have one-sixth of the world's surface, why risk it." The Utopian philosophy of "socialism in one country" with its illegitimate American offspring "exceptionalism" (which by the way is only a new cloak for the old Kautskian theory of "ultra-imperialism" so much spouted about during the war as a crutch for social chauvinism). This theory in substance assumed that capitalism was entering a new era of development. New "vitality" (Pepper) would be injected into the decrepit body of decaying Capitalism, and as a consequence the question of the revolution must be substituted for a long range battle of nibbling. The orientation for political struggle must be a working alliance with the petty bourgeois farmer who still had a "progressive" role to perform within vital "capitalism". The proletarian was to follow humbly the chariot of LaFollette, Chiang Kai-Shek, Raditch, etc. The victory of this famous theory ca nbe read in the lessons of the dead and mangled Chinese Communists whose heap of corpses should be placed as a monument to the gentlemen of the Right and their allies of the Center, to their everlasting damnation.

Is the soil of the Comintern "all sufficient" (Trotsky) for the immediate future? Unquestionably. The Comintern still represents the center created by the October revolution. Its base is still the first worker's government, postulated as the first installment on the world revolution.

The complete victory of the restorationist elements is still remote. The basic cultural gains from the standpoint of creating a basis of proletarian ideology is still the outstanding factor of the dictatorship. The very fact of Centrism having to play the adventurist role of revolution in the west (Third Period) is conclusive indication of that.

We accept that the role of World Imperialism with America at its head, has reached the stage of **progressive decline.** Expansion, which is the life blood of the system, can only be carried on on the basis of further incursion into the standards of living of the working class, and that on a constantly increasing sacle. The previous basis for the expansion of American imperialism following the World War, which consisted of the export of finance capital to all parts of the globe at the expense of its exhausted European rivals, is constanly being narrowed. World capitalism has truly reached the stage where "the productive forces have burst the bonds of property relations" (Marx).

Prospects for Future

All further existence can continue at the expense of more systematic repression against the working class and other oppressed peoples. The prospect for the future is on the one hand systematic reductions of labor costs (wages) imposed upon the large number of unskilled and semi-skilled workers in basic industries in order to compete successfully in the shrinking world market, and on the other the more deliberate and systematic raising of a labor aristocracy, thereby helping the further maturing of the illusions of social reformism. The perspectives arising out of such a situation before us on the one hand the possibilities of bitter spontaneous resistance, which can be translated in the immediate into broad instruments of struggle (new unions) reflecting the mass nature of large scale industry. On the other, a systematic attack and exposure of the real role of social reformism.

The responsibility resting on the Left Opposition in the face of these developments is no less than that of assuming the task of once more forcing the Communist movement to put on the order of the day, the world revolution. Can this wholy and exclusively be performed by accepting the role of a faction of the Communist Party under any and all conditions or does it not devolve upon us the responsibility of a close examination of the Comintern?

The relative strength of the Opposition forces to that of the party. The ripeness of the objective factors within the class struggle in a given country.

Can we, in the face of the developing class struggle and the failure of the Stalinist bureaucracy to apply the needed lesson, content ourselves with the passive role of abstract criticism? Is it not the Leninist conception of a faction that its role must at all times be that of winning the confidence of the toiling masses by examples of objective application of real leadership in the every day struggles? That real political contact is built up only in this fashion. Examples of real Communist leadership in the unfolding class struggle in America will do more to help shape the forces of Communism both in the formal party and those out of its ranks than a thousand abstract formulations. If the party still contained the best politically organized and oriented Communist workers here in America, then our task would be quite simple. The facts are however, that the party's base of strength as well as its composition has narrowed, and this in the face of a severe unemployed crisis. Systematic wage cuttings, rising indications of labor resistance (Lawrence Harlan, Kentucky, Pennsylvania West Virginia, the brewing situations in the railroad and steel industries) and those in the immediate present. (To Be Continued).

—S. M. ROSE.

Call the Troopers

A worker writes from the camp:

An incident characteristic of the relationships between the worker-Communists and the Stalinist bureaucrats took place two weeks ago at Camp Wocolona which has created a scandal among the workers staying at the camp and in the ranks of the party as far off as New York. The camp manager, a party functionary named Joe Newman, has ranged himself like a petty, arrogant shopkeeper against the workers employed in the camp. The dispute was concerned with grievances over working conditions prevailing in the camp, grievances advanced through the Food Workers Industrial Union and its members. One of the workers earned the particular displeasure of Newman by his refusal to submit meekly to the arbitrary anti-Communist commands of his "boss". This worker, himself a party member, is at this very moment involved in charges that may mean his deportation from the United States, because of his militant activities in Left wing strikes and in party demonstrations. Because he would not act as a toady of Newman's and silently swallow the latter's demands—which conflicted with the interests of the camp workers—Newman demanded that he be taken off his job and run out of the camp. The worker defied him. Newman thereupon threatened to call in State Troopers to pull the worker out of the camp by violence! It was only after the promptest protest of the workers that Newman withdrew his threat. But the mere fact that this "Communist" could make such a threat is sufficient to reveal his caliber. Scandalous as this particular incident may be, it is not at all inexplicable. Newman, like his fellow functionaries is "loyal" to the "party line"—whatever it may be for the moment. With this "loyalty" he is able to rise to the ranks of the bureaucracy and to buy himself off from control of the ranks. Fortified by the feeling that the "cattle" he commands have nothing to say or do about his words or deeds, he can allow himself any arbitrary, and even reactionary measure. Every day brings new examples of the irreconcilable conflict between the needs and interests of the party and the interests of the party bureaucracy. The Newman case is one of them.

Weisbord --- No Comment!

From comrade Bernard Morgenstern, Philadelphia Oppositionist recently convicted with comrade Leon Goodman under the Anti-Sedition Act, we have received the following letter which we print in full without comment:

* * * *

COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF STRUGGLE
(Adhering to the International Left Opposition)
212 East 9th St., New York, N. Y.
July 6, 1931.

Dear Comrade Morgenstern:

I read in the last issue of the **Militant** that you have been convicted. I am writing to you alone but of course I include comrade Goodman also. The question is what is to be done?

From the very beginning we importuned Cannon and Co. to call a conference for your defense. They said that would be a united front with the Right against the Party! I am quite sure that if Cannon were involved such a conference would have been called long ago. But now the big thing is the principle involved: no united front against the Party even when the Party sends you to jail.

How can you stand that sort of stuff? You know that since I saw you last the weekly **Militant** has been issued and still not one word about the government attack on our paper the **Class Struggle.** We look upon any person holding such views to justify the **Militant** refusing to join us in resisting the government's attack upon the Communist press as out and out agents of the bourgeoisie. We will deal with such elements with our fists and not with reason. The Cannons and the Shachtmans must be driven out of the entire Communist and labor movement when they can stoop to such actions as these. And it will be our job to do it too. Such people are not Communists. They are scum.

Please let us know how things are going on in Philadelphia, and what final disposition is made of your case and that of comrade Goodman.

Fraternally,
(Sgd.) Albert Weisbord.

In Spain

The Revolutionary Events Day by Day

(Continued from page 1)

Spanish Communism accepts our slogan issued more than a year ago on the subject of the national congress for the unification of the Communist forces in Spain.

The "Batallists" of the C. B.-C. F. were the first to make our slogan their own. With unexampled impudence, the troops of Maurin and Arlandis wanted to have people believe that it came from them. They claimed it in order to pursue two different aims: to attribute to themselves the success obtained by the S. C. O. and to prevent being called "Trotskyists" because of accepting our slogan. The "Batallists" went so far as to pass over in silence our registered letters in which we expounded our point of view on the National Unity Congress at the same time that we gave it our adherence. Maurin and Co. did not act very correctly in this affair, even though they finally replied to us a few days ago, accepting our adherence to the congress. The S. C. O., of course, will send its delegates there.

But there is something that interests us a great deal more than the position and the attiude of the C.-B. C. F. It is the organization affiliated to the E. C. of the official C. P. which ask for the celebration of a unity congress. These are the affiliates of the Bunot (Valencia) district and the Federation of Communist Youth of the Levant region who address themselves to all the Communist groups and factions including the S. C. O. and **Comunismo**—the "Batallists" would not dare to do it—in order to have the unification congress take place within a maximum period of two months.

The desire for unity is latent in all the rank and file organizations of Spanish Communism. Only the bureaucrats stand opposed to the unification of the Spanish Communist forces.

That is how agreement has been reached on the basis of one of the slogans of the Left Opposition. Needless to say, the S. C. O. continues to orient the movement for unity.

PERSECUTIONS AGAINST US

The letters that reach us from our friends in Estremadura are truly alarming. In Esaremadura there does not exist a single affiliate to the Spanish C. P. All the Communists of Estremadura belong to the S. C. O. Our friends are brutally persecuted by the authorities and by the socialists. The correspondence which they receive comes to them opened. The newspapers and magazines rarely arrive in their wrappers. A postal employee has been kind enough to warn our comrades so that they may find another way of sending their press mail. Our friends are threatened with being discharged from their work and being put into prison if they continue to propagate the ideas of the S. C. O. and to distribute **Comunismo.**

All this takes place right under the republic regime. It is certain that the Stalinist dunderheads will continue to call us allies of the bourgeoisie. But our Estremadura comrades will not cease because of that, to propagate and to defend our ideas.

IN THE MIDST OF THE ELECTIONS

We are right in the midst of the elections to the Constituent Cortes, and yet one does not observe the slightest agitation of the political parties. We refer, of course, to external agitation, for within the political parties and inside of the Republican-Socialist coalition, the uneasiness is enormous. It serves no purpose for the leaders of the coalition parties to declare themselves firmly united and ready for the decisive battle against the defunct regime. The rank and file organizations take it upon themselves to show the contrary, sometimes out of ambition, and at others out of political disagreement. The socialists and the socialist-radidcals have dissolved the coalition in certain localities and are preparing to intervene in the struggle independently.

The Socialist-Radical party has been divided into two, because the Madrid organization the smallest in the party, differed from the point of view of the national leadership of the party which defends the unity of the coalition. Madrid, where the socialist-radical group embraces a large number of workers, has voted to break up the coalition and, since its opinion has been rejected, it has separated from the Socialist-Radical party and is preparing to enter into the struggle independently.

This circumstances substantially weakens the position of this party, which is the one that today counts the greatest sympathy among the electoral opinion.

The Communists also come forward dividedly. The independent Communist grouping of Madrid, after having proposed the united front to the official Communist grouping, a united front which the latter rejected, has decided to present its own candidates against those of the official C. P. This confused position of the Autonomous Grouping places it openly against the Communist party. It is not a question any longer of a struggle against the Stalinist bureaucracy but of an open struggle against the C. P. We must combat those responsible for the division of the Communist forces, but never, still less in the present moment, must we defy the ranks of the party.

It is needless to say that the C.-B. C. F. is presenting its own candidates. Spanish Communism, absolutely disorganized, goes into the struggle divided and without any chance of success.

The electoral struggle presents itself very clearly. The government will triumph with an overwhelming majority. The monarchists will get a not very important minority and that will be the case with the other independent political sectors.

Madrid, June 18, 1931

* * * *

THE STRIKES

The strike movement for economic demands of the working class was rendered profoundly acute last week and has had its political repercussions for the country and for the government.

The fishermen's strike in Pasajes, strangled in blood by the Civil Guard was echoed in the solidarity strike proclaimed by the building trades workers of Bilbao who, at the same time, are fighting against the compulsory strike in solidarity with the unemployed. And in this solidarity strike too there have been worker-victims, wounded by the revolvers and rifles of the forces.

In Andalusia, upon the announcement of the strike of the peasants, the state of seige was extended throughout the whole region. Although the constitution in force declares that in election periods the propaganda of all ideas will be permitted, the captain-general of the region has declared that the declaration of the strike will be considered as a crime of high treason; he denies the peasants the right under the republican regime, to ask for bread or for work.

The strike of the Asturian miners may be considered as lost. But the revolutionary morale of the coal mine workers comes out of the strike strengthened. The union of all the bourgeois forces and of their allies was realized against them in the region and in the province. The republican government dispatched the civil guard, in mass, to defend the interests of the capitalists. The social democrats organized their milita of strike-breakers armed by the government itself, flung into the struggle against the strikes. The strike entered a period of regression; the workers were almost decided upon a strategic return. The only means of saving the fight was the congress now being held by the National Confederation of Labor. But the anarcho-syndicalists too are more interested in fighting against the Communists than in supporting the Asturian miners and their trade union, adhering to the N. C. of L. but led by the Communists; whether the fight fails or not interests our anarcho-syndicalists very little.

Other strike conflicts have broken out or are announced: Cordova, Malaga, Barcelona, etc. and the government is more and more determined, according to various declarations by its representatives, to proceed against the strike organizers with violence. Which is as much as saying that it proposes to deal with violence with every movement of working class demands.

THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE N. C. of L.

An extended article will be devoted to the congress now being held with an extraordinary character at Madrid, of the Spanish National Confederation of Labor. But here are some details now for the readers of the **Militant.** After the first moments, a current was manifested against Communism. On the order of the day there stood a proposal recommending the expulsion from the N. C. of L. of all the Communists who appeared as candidates on any list of any political party whatsoever. In reality, it was a question of expelling from the N. C. of L. the outstanding Communists. But this proposal was not discussed by the Congress, still less approved. It actually proved the degree of anti-Communist phobia that emanated from the congress. But in spite of all the voice of all the organizations had to make itself heard. This did not happen without difficulty. A few delegates, Communist candidates in the elections of April 12, were challenged by the congress on the pretext that on the order of the day stood a proposal demanding their expulsion. When a delegate from the Asturias, an anarchist moreover, proposed that this vexatious question of expulsions be left for the end and that they pass over immediately to the discussion of the question of aid to the Asturian miners on strike, the delegates interrupted and insulted him without taking into account that he was an anarchist, until he exclaimed: "Long live anarchy!"

Thus, it is in this atmosphere, hostile to Communism with the most absolute lack of trade union democracy, that the second national congress of the N. C. of L. was opened.

Madrid, June 21, 1931

—HENRI LACROIX

A Proposal to Gitlow

From the current number of **Revolutionary Age**, we learn from an article by Ben Gitlow on the "Results of the July Plenum" of the Lovestone group that among the decisions adopted were the following two:

"2. To recommend to the National Bureau to change the name of the group.

"4. To give full power to the National Bureau to change the name of the **Revolutionary Age** if it finds it necessary to do so."

Our shop manager, Kent, was the first one to welcome the decision. He is a steady reader of the **Age,** although he is somewhat timid and honest. In addition, he is always on the lookout for an odd piece of change in these hard times, and under the impression that some prize may be awarded for the best substitute names, he is proposing to secretary Gitlow the following arguments for the changes he offers:

1. The name of an organization should really be a mirror of its political quality. His honesty is injured at the idea that the Right wing faction should call itself "Communist Party of the United States of America (Majority Group)". He proposes a change of name which has the double advantage of being a more accurate description of the Lovestone group and of not involving too much of a difference in the initials. Instead of "C. P. U. S. A. (M. G.)", he proposes the name "C. P. L. A. (M. G.)", that is, Conference for Progressive Labor Action (Minority Group). The name would enable the Lovestoneites to function more formally as the Left wing of the Muste group.

2. In this proposal, the consequences of Kent's timidity coincide with those of Lovestone's political conceptions. Lovestone believes our epoch to be a revolutionary age almost everywhere but in the United States. Besides, the name **"Revolutionary Age"** IS a bit radical for such conservative people. So he proposes to change the name of the paper to the **Victorian Age.**

We pass on these proposals to Gitlow for what they are worth. Ourselves, we think that if any prize is to be offered for the most appropriate changes, it should go to Kent.

Books

by Leon Trotsky

THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL
A Criticism of Fundamentals
Introduction by J. P. Cannon
140 pages hard paper cover 35c

THE STRATEGY OF THE WORLD REVOLUTION
86 pages, two-colored paper cover 25c
Introduction by Max Shachtman

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION
30 pages, paper cover 10c

COMMUNISM AND SYNDICALISM
The Trade Union Question
Introduction by James P. Cannon
64 pages, paper cover 15c

THE PERMANENT REVOLUTION
208 page book—cloth bound 1.00
paper bound .50

TURN IN THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL AND THE GERMAN SITUATION
30 pages, paper cover 10c

SINCE LENIN DIED
By Max Eastman
1924 50c
158 page book printed in London

THE REAL SITUATION IN RUSSIA
Introduction by Max Eastman
364 page book formerly $2 now 1.00

MY LIFE—600 pages 5.00

Just Off. the Press

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER
64 pages paper cover 15c

PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE U. S. S. R.
48 pages, paper cover 15c
Special Rates in Bundles of 5 or more

Order from
PIONEER PUBLISHERS
84 East 10th Street
New York City

W A N T E D
Literature Agents
to sell our pamphlets and books.
Special inducement to unemployed comrades, in the way of a liberal discount.
One comrade in New York sold over 500 pamphlets within 10 days.
Write for details.
Pioneer Publishers
84 East 10th St.,
New York City

Subscribe!

With the **Militant** now appearing weekly there should be excellent possibilities for all of our supporters to enlist new subscribers. If you agree with us you will want to extend the **Militant** circulation. You will want to keep your own subscription paid up to date. If the number on the wrapper of this issue is less than 75, it means that you should renew your sub. Next you should endeavor to get other workers to become subscribers. For convenience use the blank below.

THE MILITANT,

84 East 10th Street, New York City.
Please enter me for a subscription one year, $2.00; six months, $1.00.

Name ..... Address.....

City ..... State .....

TWO NEW PAMPHLETS
For the Pre-Conference Dicussion

by LEON TROTSKY

THE SPANISH REVOLUTION IN DANGER
64 pages — 15c per copy Special Rates in Bundles

PROBLEMS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE U. S. S. R.
48 pages — 15c per copy

PIONEER PUBLISHERS
84 East 10th Street
New York City

EDITORIAL NOTES

A WELCOME REVERSAL

Experience is a costly teacher, but an effective one. Having suffered the full consequences of the "stay at work" policy during Schlesinger's strike maneuvers, the Left wing in the needle trades is striving to avoid a similar debacle in the Amalgamated. The Rank and File Committee in the Hillman Union—the Left wing group dominated by the party—has issued a statement on the stoppage announced by the Amalgamated. The statement describes the stoppage as a strategem to put over a deal between the Hillman bureaucracy and the bosses against the members of the union. It advises the clothing workers to "turn the stoppage into a real struggle of all clothing workers for better conditions in the shops."

On both these points the statement of the Rank and File Committee is surely correct. It shows beyond all doubt that the Left wing militants in the needle trades have learned something from the bludgeoning they have endured as a result of the treacherous policy imposed upon them in recent times by the Centrist bureaucrats.

During the Schlesinger strike, the Left wing it will be remembered, had a different policy. At that time the Stalinists said, and not without a certain justification as is the case now in the Amalgamated, that the strike was a fake. And from this they drew the conclusion that the Left wing militants should stay at work while the Right wing workers went out. By this policy, which they enforced against all protests, they deprived the Left wing of all possibility to influence the masses of workers in the streets. They gave the reactionaries a powerful weapon which they used to the full against the Left wing. If Schlesinger were to give credit where credit is due for the present entrenchment of the Right wing union he would have to make heavy acknowledgments to the "stay at work" slogan of the Communist party.

The Opposition hammered this slogan and advised, instead, that the Left wing militants go out with the rest and steer the movement into the path of struggle. The advice was without avail them. An experiment was necessary to expose the complete emptiness of the Centrist policy. The experience was bitter but not entirely in vain. Nobody would dare to tell the needle trades workers to repeat that sorry performance.

We can only welcome the reversal of tactics in this respect. The policy of the party in the needle trades today, despite many changes, is yet by no means fully correct. But we can be thankful that the suicidal slogan of "stay at work" while the Right wing workers are on the street, is no more. This is progress painfully achieved but all the surer for it. It is another demonstration that the policy of the Opposition can make its way, even if after ruinous delays, when experience has reinforced and confirmed its correctness. But that is just the power of the Marxist platform of the Left Opposition: it stands up under the test of events.

AGAIN THE UNION SQUARE MEETING

For us the defense of class war prisoners is a class question. We proceed from the point of view that, they are hostages held by the class enemy. They are not the private property of any organization, party, group, sect or faction. Regardless of their individual views they are entitled to the solidarity and support of the workers as a class, and especially of all the advanced and conscious elements. However we may be divided on this or that question of principle we should present a united front to the class enemy in defense of every persecuted worker, whoever he may be. It is from this standpoint that we protested in a recent issue of the **Militant** against the conduct of the I. W. W. in the Union Square meeting for the Centralia prisoners.

The July 21 issue of **Solidarity** returns to the discussion only to demonstrate anew the sectarian point of view and to justify the objections we have brought against it. We are now informed, in an article by Jack Kenney that the meeting "was not called as a 'united front' meeting . . . it was called by the General Defense and invitations were sent to organizations and groups asking them to send speakers." That is no answer to the point of our objection. The question of auspices is more or less a formality in such a case. It is the organizations invited and represented on the platform which determine the character of the meeting.

If it was not even intended to be a united front, as the author states, it only makes matters worse and shows up a narrow-minded conception which is far removed from the idea of a class defense of persecuted and imprisoned militants. It was a united front, alright, but a very peculiar one—a united front without the Communist party. Why was it excluded? This is the question we raised. It has not been answered, because it cannot be answered on the ground of the real interests of the class war prisoners.

Kenney found it necessary to defend the presence of the "yellow socialists" who were invited to the meeting. We did not object to that; we protested against a friendly solidarity with them as against the Communists. The article in **Solidarity** justifies this reactionary policy with the statement: "We at least know where the 'yellow socialists' stand." Is that really so? Then you must know that they—that is the leaders—have stood on the side of the prosecuting attorney in the case of every Left wing militant in the needle trades sent to jail or prison in recent years. If you know where they stand, your management of the Union Square meeting is all the more indefensible, and our criticism of it is all the more justified.

The article in **Solidarity** includes a defense of the "anarchist wind bag". Kenney overlooks no questions except the most important one. He says: "Perhaps his remarks about Russia are objected to." Of course they are objected to. He adds: "If so, then wherein did he misrepresent the situation in Russia?" Well, we could answer that question at great length and have done so more than once. But allow us to answer the question here with another question: If you think it was quite in order for the Anarchist to air his views on Russia at the Union Square meeting, did you expect comrade Swabeck to devote his speech to a refutation? In that case you should have advertised a public free-for-all debate on the principle disputes in the labor movement. Such a discussion, announced for what it is, would have a value and the Communist League would no doubt participate. But the staging of this debate under the guise of a defense meeting for the Centralia men is out of place. The class war prisoners are entitled to more respect and consideration that that.

FIELD ORGANIZERS OF THE OPPOSITION

Among the signs of consolidation of the Communist League and the development of its activities, the appearance of voluntary organizers in the field is not the least significant. The emergence of capable and self-sacrificing forces who carry the message into new fields is an unfailing mark of vitality in our movement. For several weeks comrades Clarke and Stamm have been doing pioneer work as field organizers in the Cleveland territory and we have every reason for the confidence that the firm basis is being laid for the establishment of a functioning branch of the League.

For us such an achievement will have a great importance. Every new oppositionist counts, and is worth effort to gain; the formation of a new branch is an achievement which our entire organization can justly celebrate. Our numbers are few but solid. They are strong in ideas and by them will prevail. Every accession of new forces educated in the Marxist doctrines of our movement and inspired with its unconquerable spirit, hastens on the day. Those who make it possible by patient work of propaganda and organization in the field will be highly regarded by every Oppositionist.

The field work of the comrades in Cleveland, of great value in itself, has an even greater significance as an example. By deliberately picking out the field of operations in agreement with the National Committee, travelling without railroad fare and maintaining themselves in the field on their own resources, with only nominal assistance from the organization, they are showing how a movement which has no money can have organizers, if it has the men. We shall see more of this in the near future, if we are not greatly mistaken. The young revolutionists, trained in the school of the Opposition will be fired with the ambition to work for the movement and will do it at all cost. The path of the pioneer organizers at Cleveland will be followed by tens and scores as our movement grows, takes root and becomes the movement of the workers' vanguard, as it inevitably will.

In this way the bona-fide type of professional revolutionist will grow up, receive his training and prove his worth in the hard school of experience and come to leadership of the party and the class. In the best days of the I. W. W. and to a lesser extent in the Socialist party, the movement was recruited and kept alive in no small degree by the "voluntary organizers" who took it upon themselves—without definite pay or guarantees—to carry the propaganda to the masses. Today's movement, on higher ground and on a firmer foundation, will measure its growth in no small degree by the number of such organizers it enlists.

Professional revolutionists we must have, for the leadership of the revolutionary movement is a full-time occupation. But by that term we do not think of the satisfied official who weighs every service to the movement and exacts pay in a sort of business relationship. We think rather of the militant who devotes his activities entirely to the movement and takes his chances. Every step toward the creation of such a cadre represents progress. —J. P. C.

THE MILITANT

Vol. IV, No. 17, August 1, 1931

Published weekly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at 84 East 10th Street, N. Y.

Editorial Board

Martin Abern James P. Cannon
Max Shachtman Maurice Spector
Arne Swabeck

Subscription rate: $2.00 per year; foreigh $2.50. Five cents per copy. Bundle rates, 3 cents per copy

BEHIND THE MINERS STRIKE

Economic Decay in Soft Coal

The soft coal industry is especially worth studying at this time because of the militant strike movemen in a number of fields, because of its fundamental importance to industry and because it illustrates many of the features of industrial decay under capitalism, and points a way which will be trodden by more and more industries as time goes on.

Where Coal Comes From

The earliest recorded soft coal workings in this country were in Virginia, in 1750. Since then it has been discovered in over thirty different states in this country, but most of the coal west of the Mississippi is too low in grade to have more than a local importance. Over 90 percent of the coal produced in the United States comes from nine states, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky and Alabama in the Eastern or Appalachian field, Illinois and Indiana in the Middle Western field and Colorado in the Rocky Mountain field. The quality of the coal mined, or its "rank", varies widely, and with it varies the commercial value, which determines the distance to which it can be shipped in competition with other fuels. The highest grade coal is that from some of the West Virginia fields, particularly the "smokeless" Pocahontas and New River coals, considered the finest in the world except possibly the British Admiralty coals. The quality is determined by a high percentage of fixed carbon in relation to volatile matter, low moisture and ash content and low percentage of impurities, the worst of which is sulphur.

The cost of mining depends in large part on the thickness of the coal deposit or seam, the presence or degree of slate, "bony coal", and other solid impurities, the extent of mechanization, the flatness and continuity or on the other hand steep pitch and broken-up geology of the deposit. The combination of differing commercial value of coal produced and differing costs of production has resulted in substantial differences in the ability of the various fields to compete with each other.

Shift of Coal Felds

In practise, this has resulted in a shifting of the market away from certain fields and towards others. The fields which have been losing out in competition have resulted in violent efforts to cut wages in an effort to maintain profits; the others have cut wages in the effort to maintain their competitive superiority. The result to date has been a clear-cut and increasing superiority of the West Virginia and Kentucky fields to the detriment of Illinois and Indiana while Pensylvania has largely held its own as indicated by the following figures. (See table above).

"The West Virginia) operators," according to an engineering expert, "might be quite properly termed the pirates of the coal trade, standing ready at all times to descend on any fat prize that may appear on the horizon. Let a shortage of fuel appear in the Northwest or in New England and the West Virginia producers will soon be on the job with their high-grade coals gobbling up the main plums, much to the chagrin of the Illinois or Pennsylvania producers as the case may be. For the Ohio mines, handicapped by somewhat inferior coals and union scales, they have an indifference bordering on contempt; in times of a full market the West Virginia mines have only to reduce their wage scales, a matter the miners are not liable to protest when work is slack, and they can put their high-grade coals down in the heart of the Ohio mining districts cheaper than the local mines can produce it themselves".

Key Position of West Va.

The West Virginia fields therefore occupy a key position in the industry, from a labor point of view as well as from that of the operator. Control of these fields is indispensable in view of their ability to throw enormous tonnages on the market when strikes are on in other fields; on the other hand, a free rein to unionize Illinois and Indiana is worthless for a national union if purchased at the expense of "hands off West Virginia and Kentucky".

The latest figures show that this superiority has been intensified since the depression: in the week ended July 4, 1931 a total of 5,961,000 tons of soft coal was mined in the United States, against an average of 11,208,000 per week in July 1923, a falling off of 46 percent. Illinois and Indiana fell off 54 and 60 percent respectively, and Pennsylvania 57 percent, while the decline in West Virginia amounted to less than 11 percent in the Southern field and less than 28 percent for the state as a whole, and Kentucky production declined only 26 percent.

The shifting of markets within the soft coal industry has taken place against a background of absolute and relative decline in the demand for coal. For many years up to 1918, the consumption of coal in the United States increased at the rate of 16,800,000 tons per annum In 1917 the consumption (including exports, which amount to 3-4 percent of the total in normal years) totalled 553,000,000 tons; this figure was not reached again until 1926, when the British coal strike stimulated exports and brought total sales to 567,000 000 tons; in 1929, at the peak of "prosperity", total demand was 537,000,000, and last year indications are that the sales were 465,000,000 tons.

The average anual consumption per capita from 1912 to 1914 was 8,946 pounds of soft coal; the average for the years 1926-1928 was 8,608 pounds, and last year was about 7,314 pounds.

	1924	1929
Total Coal Produced	484,000,000 tons	533,000,000
Pennsylvania	130,600,000	142 400,000
West Virginia	101,700,000	138,000,000
Illinois	68,300,000	60,100,000
Kentucky	45.100 000	60,600,000
Ohio	30,500,000	23.700,000
Indiana	21,500,000	18,000,000
Alabama	19,100,000	17 700,000
Virginia	10,700,000	13,100,000
Colorado	10,400,000	10,400 000

Reason For Market Loss

The basic reason for the loss of markets has been the displacement of coal by other forms of energy supply, notably water power for the generation of electricity, fuel oil and natural gas, and second, increasing efficiency in the utilization of coal by the railroads, who took 21½ percent of the domestic consumption of coal last year by the electric utility companies, who took 9½ percent and by other large industrial consumers.

Of the total energy from all sources used in the U. S. in 1913, coal, hard and soft, supplied 84.4 percent, oil and gas 7.1 percent, and water power 4.2 percent, by 1928 the latest year for which U. S. Bureau of Mines data are available, the proportion contributed by coal was 67.5 percent, by oil and gas 18.2 percent, and by water power 8.9 percent. Indicating increased efficiency of use, as recently as 1920 the average electrical company throughout the United States burned 3 pounds of coal under its boilers to produce a kilowatt-hour of current supply—by 1929 the figure had declined to 1.9 pounds, and the best practice in the country was 7-10ths of a pound, indicating the extent of the possible further losses. In 1920 the average railroad consumed 174 pounds of coal in carrying 1 000 tons (including freight, locomotive and tender) a distance of one mile; by 1929 the average figure was down to 125 pounds. Similarly, in 1917 the steel mills consumed an average of 3,524 pounds of coking coal in making a ton of pig iron; now they need less than 3,000 pounds, a decline of over 15 percent.

In the definition of "economic old age" given in a previous article in this series, two outstanding features were the low rate of profit and the tendency toward concentration and mechanization. According to a compilation by the National City Bank twenty-eight coal mining companies, with a combined capitalization around $600,000,000, earned net profits of 1.6 percent on their capital and surplus in 1929 and 1.3 percent in 1930. To the extent that these figures are representative, they indicate one reason for the bitterness which has marked labor struggles in the coal mines for a "diminishing ration" of profits on the operator's side.

Financial Concentration

The tendency toward financial concentration in the coal industry will be clear from the following data. In 1920 there were 6 277 recognized commercial soft coal producers; by 1930 there were only 4,612. The mortalities were severest in the class of mines producing from 10,000 to 50,000 tons a year, of whom 51 percent disappeared in these ten years; the mines producing 50-100,000 and 100-200 000 tons a year were also hard hit. On the other hand, the class producing 500,000 tons a year and over actually increased, both in numbers and in output This class was responsible for 29.2 percent of the total output in 1895, for 48.3 percent in 1905, 47.8 percent in 1920 when there was a temporary boom in coal encouraging the small mine, and 59.8 percent in 1929. With the present hard times in the industry, the proportion of the output controlled by the big mines must be still larger.

This means that the miner in his struggles is facing a financially stronger unit, on the average, than in the past and the necessity for national organization is even more pressing than hitherto.

The proportion of coal mined "mechanically", that is, by the use of mechanical loaders and conveyors underground, has increased rapidly. From 21-600,000 tons in 1928 the output of mechanically mined coal increased to 37,900,000 tons in 1929 and 46 800.000 tons last year, an increase during a year of crisis of 23.7 percent. The tendency was most pronounced in Illinois where an additional tonnage of 4,550,000 tons was mechanically mined in 1930 over 1929, an increase of 24.9 percent; in Pennsylvania the increase was 2,800,000 tons or 66.2 percent, in Alabama 1,100 000 tons, or 120.6 percent.

Mechanization of Mines

These figures do not include the 20,000,000 tons loaded by power shovels in strip mines which involve mechanization on an even larger scale. In strip pits, the coal lies close to the surface, and the earth covering or "overburden" is stripped off with shovels and the coal exposed in open pits, which are then worked by steam or electric shovels. The cost of a 15-yard shovel of the latest type with caterpillar treads, completley installed, is half a million dollars. The average production per man per day, which is about 4 3-4 tons for the entire industry, averaged 13 tons per man per day in strip operations in 1928, against 5.1 tons per day per man in 1914, when the average for the entire industry was 3.61 tons.

It is not a coincidence that some of the bitterest struggles of the miners have been in the most highly mechanized operations, where the owner's stake was highest and his financial strength corresponding. The Wildwood mine of the Butler Consolidated Coal Co. the first mine in the United States completely laid out from the beginning for mechanized operation, has been the scene of some of the hardest fighting in the present strike in the western Pennsylvania fields. The fighting around Herrin, Illinois, in the 1922 strike, centered around a strip mining operation of the Southern Illinois Coal Company.

The coal operator today faces a narrowing market under the whip of competitive economic pressure to maintain or enlarge his profits to acquire a financial base for the increasing mechanization which is being installed throughout the industry. He will put up a terrific resistance to the maintenance of decent living standards by the miners. The miners will need every advantage of organization and leadership to make good their counter-resistance, and carry the struggle further from defensive to offensive economic lines and ultimately out of the economic field into the broadest political demands.

—B. J. FIELD.

Bucharin and the Permanent Revolution

At the beginning of 1918, Bucharin wrote in a pamphlet devoted to the October revolution:

"The fall of the imperialist regime was prepared by all the preceding history of the revolution. But this fall, and **the victory of the proletariat** supported by the poor peasantry, a victory which at one blow opened up immense horizons throughout the world, **is not yet the beginning of an organic epoch** . . . Before the Russian proletariat is posed more acutely than ever before, the **problem of the world revolution.** All the relations that have developed in Europe lead towards this inevitable end. Thus **the permanent revolution in Russia is converted into a European revolution of the proletariat."** ("From the Fall of Czarism to the Fall of the Bourgeoisie" by N. Bucharin, page 78. Our emphasis.)

The pamphlet concluded with the following words:

"Into the powder magazine of blood-stained old Europe has been thrown the torch of the Russian socialist revolution. It has not died. It lives. It expands. It will inevitably fuse with the great victorious uprisings of the world proletariat." (Ibid, page 144.)

How far removed from the theory of socialism in one country was Bucharin at that time!

Everyone knows that Bucharin was the principal, and in reality, the only theoretician of all the campaigns against Trotskyism which were summed up in the struggle against the permanent revolution. But earlier, when the lava of the revolutionary overthrow had not yet had time to grow cool, Bucharin, as we see, could find no other characterization of the revolution than the definition against which, a few years later, he had to fight so mercilessly.

The pamphlet by Bucharin appeared in "Priboy", the publishing house of the Central Committee of the party. Not only did nobody declare this pamphlet heretical, but on the contrary, everyone saw in it the official and indisputable expression of the views of the party Central Committee.

In this way the pamphlet was reprinted many times in the course of the following years, and together with another one devoted to the February revolution, under the joint title "From the Collapse of Czarism to the Fall of the Bourgeoisie", it was translated into German, French, English and other languages.

In 1923, the pamphlet—probably for the last time—was printed by the Kharkov Party Publishing House "Proletarii", and in the preface to it was expressed the conviction that the pamphlet has "an enormous importance" not only for the new members of the party, for the Youth etc., but also "for the old Bolshevik guard of the illegal period of our party".

That Bucharin is not endowed with any particular firmness in his opinions, is well enough known. But it is not a question of Bucharin. If one is to lend credence to the legend, created for the first time in the Fall of 1924, that between Lenin's conception of the revolution and Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution there existed an unbridgable chasm, and that the old party generation was educated in the understanding of the irreconcilability of these two theories, then how could Bucharin at the beginning of 1918 propagate with complete impunity this theory, which he called the theory of the permanent revolution? Why did nobody—absolutely nobody—in the party come forward against Bucharin? How and why did the publishing house of the party Central Committee issue the pamphlet? How and why did Lenin keep quiet? How and why did the Comintern publish the pamphlet by Bucharin, defending the permanent revolution, into various languages? How and why did Bucharin's pamphlet retain the title of party manual almost up to the death of Lenin? How and why was the pamphlet reprinted in 1923 in Kharkov, future center of Stalinist fanaticism and warmly recommended to the party youth as well as to the old Bolshevik guard?

Bucharin's pamphlet is distinguished from his subsequent writings and in general from all the latest Stalinist historiography not only in the characterization of the revolution but also of its leaders. Here, for example, is what it says on page 131 of the Kharkov edition:

"The central point of political life becomes . . . not the pitiful Soviet of the republic, but the future congress of the All-Russian revolution. In the center of this work of mobilization stood the Petersburg Soviet which demonstratively elected to its presidency, comrade Leon Trotsky, the most brilliant tribune of the proletarian insurrection."

Further on, on page 138:

"On October 25, Trotsky, the brilliant and valiant tribune of the revolt, the indefatigable and ardent agitator, the apostle of the revolution, declared in the name of the Revolutionary Military Committee to the Petersburg Soviet, amid thunderous applause from those present, that the 'provisional government no longer exists'. And as living proof of this fact, Lenin appeared, greeted with a stormy ovation, **liberated from illegality by the new revolution."**

In 1923-1924, the flood of the socalled discussion against Trotskyism was let loose. It destroyed much of what had been built up by the October revolution, it submerged the papers, libraries reading-rooms, and under its slime and dirt was buried an innumerable quantity of documents relating to the greatest epoch in the development of the party and of the revolution. Now these documents must be dragged out bit by bit in order to reconstruct that which was.

The Permanent Revolution in Lenin's Time

In 1921, there appeared in English one of the many editions of an old work of Trotsky: "A Review and Some Perspectives", which contains the most complete exposition of the theory of the permanent revolution.

The English edition is accompanied by a preface by the author dated "March 12, 1919, Kremlin", written for the Russian edition of the brochure which came out in 1919. Between this Russian edition and the English edition of 1919, a number of others appeared in various languages. In the preface of 1919, the author speaks of those differences which at one time separated him from Bolshevism in this question. Among other things, the preface says:

"Therefore, once having won power, the proletariat cannot limit itself to bourgeois democracy. It must adopt the tactics of permanent revolution i. e., to destroy the barriers between the minimum and maximum program of social democracy, to introduce more and more radical social reforms and to look for direct and immediate support in the West European revolution. This position is developed in this brochure, originally written in 1904-1906", etc.

"To destroy the barriers between the minimum and maximum program"—this is precisely the formula of the growing over of the bourgeois revolution into the socialist revolution. The premises for such a development are the conquest of power by the proletariat which, by the logic of the situation is compelled "to introduce more and more radical social reforms" . . .

Now who published this brochure? The publisher did not find it at all necessary to conceal his criminal name. On the cover is printed: "Published by the Communist International, Moscow — 1921". On the back page of the brochure it says "Printing Shop of the Comintern". Zinoviev was chairman of the Comintern, Bucharin worked there full time, the edition could not go by without them seeing it, all the more so because it was the only one. The Russian edition could not go by unnoticed by the Central Committee of the party—especially when it was published by it—or by Lenin especially.

One is constrained to ask again how, in the greatest and most burning question, not only the Central Committee but also the Comintern were able to distribute a brochure entirely devoted to the defense and to the interpretation of the theory of the permanent revolution, in which, moreover, in a preface especially written for the new edition, the author affirmed that the march of events had approved his theory? Is it possible that up until 1924 there were at the head of the Bolshevik party only blind men, ignoramuses and, still worse, Mensheviks or counter-revolutionists? Let somebody answer this question—one of hundredds, of thousands like it.